



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,430	10/04/2005	David Jeal	P08620US00/BAS	8714
881 7590 11/08/2010 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER HENNING, MATTHEW T	
			ART UNIT 2491	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/08/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

iplaw@stites.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,430

Applicant(s)

JEAL ET AL.

Examiner

MATTHEW T. HENNING

Art Unit

2491

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

This action is in response to the communication filed on 9/10/2010.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner notes that the applicants' attempt to rely upon a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 is not persuasive. The declaration is made by one of the two inventors, who has a vested interest in the application, and as such has been given very little weight. Again, however, this is a moot point, in view of the new grounds of rejection presented below.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claims 1-53 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 14-17, 18-23, 25, 34-43, 46-51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi et al. (US Patent Number 5,761,309) hereinafter referred to as Ohashi, and further in view of Vatanen (US Patent Number 6,169,890).

Regarding claims 1, 21, and 42, while Ohashi disclosed a device (card reader 11) for connection to a data processing apparatus (client terminal 12), the device (card reader 11)

1 including authentication storage means (smart card 10) operatively coupled thereto for storing
2 predetermined authentication information respective to a user (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29), the
3 authentication storage means (smart card 10) being registered with a telecommunications system
4 (authentication center) which includes authenticating means (AuC data) and for which the user
5 has a telecommunications terminal (other client terminal; Col. 11 Lines 30-33), the device (card
6 reader 11), when operatively coupled to the authentication storage means (smart card 10), being
7 responsive to an input message for deriving a response dependent on the input message and on
8 the authentication information for enabling the authenticating means (AuC data) to carry out an
9 authentication process via a communication link (network 13) with the authenticating means
10 (AuC data) in the said telecommunications system (authentication center) whereby to
11 authenticate a subsequent transaction by the user with the data processing apparatus (client
12 terminal 12) (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29), and which involves use of the data card by the
13 authentication storage means (smart card 10) (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29), and wherein the
14 device controls access to the authentication information (Ohashi Fig. 6 wherein all
15 communications in and out of the smartcard pass through the reader/writer), but Ohashi did not
16 specifically state that the predetermined authentication information stored by the authentication
17 storage means (smart card 10) corresponds to information which is used to authenticate the user
18 registered with the telecommunications system (authentication center) in relation to use of that
19 users telecommunications terminal in the telecommunications system (authentication center)
20 (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29), but the authentication process for authenticating the transaction by
21 that user with the data processing apparatus not requiring use of the user's telecommunications
22 terminal (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29) nor requiring the telecommunications terminal to be

1 actually authenticated by that information in relation to the telecommunications system (Ohashi
2 Col 12 lines 1-29).

3 Vatanen teaches an analogous system in which a user telephone's SIM card of a GSM
4 telecommunications network is used to provide authentication of a user for service transactions.
5 Vatanen teaches that the SIM card is placed in a card reader at the point of sale, the user enters a
6 PIN which is verified with data stored in the SIM card, at which point the point of sale system is
7 used to authenticate the SIM card to the GSM system, thereby providing authentication of the
8 user of the SIM card via the GSM telecommunications system, and the system further utilizing a
9 user's local authentication to the GSM-network all the way to the service provider. (Vatanen
10 Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20). Vatanen teaches that the use of
11 the local authentication of the GSM system provides high data security along with the user
12 authentication (Vatanen Summary of the Invention).

13 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
14 invention to have employed the teachings of Vatanen in the system of Ohashi by utilizing a
15 user's telephone GSM SIM card to provide the authentication of the user via the GSM system,
16 and to provide a various number of services, such as financial transactions, in the system of
17 Ohashi, as taught by Vatanen. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person
18 skilled in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to provide additional
19 services to the users, and to also provide high data security along with the user authentication of
20 the system, utilizing a strong user authentication system which was already widespread.

21 Regarding claims 2 and 22, Ohashi and Vatanen taught security data entry means for
22 obtaining security data independently of the data processing apparatus, and means for analyzing

1 the entered security data for determining whether to allow access to the predetermined
2 information (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line
3 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

4 Regarding claims 3, and 23, Ohashi and Vatanen taught wherein the data entry means
5 comprises alphanumeric data entry means (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29).

6 Regarding claims 5, 25, and 43, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the security data
7 comprises a Personal Identification Number (PIN) and the analyzing means compares the PIN
8 obtained by the security data entry means with a PIN stored on the authentication storage means
9 and only allows access to the predetermined information when the respective PINs match
10 (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5
11 Line 20).

12 Regarding claims 14 and 34, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that each user is authenticated in
13 the telecommunications system by use of a subscriber identity module, and in which the
14 authentication storage means respective to that user corresponds to or simulates the subscriber
15 identity module for that user (Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5
16 Line 20).

17 Regarding claims 15, and 35, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the transaction is a
18 transaction involving use of data processing functions of the data processing apparatus (Ohashi
19 Col. 12 Lines 30-36 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line
20 20).

Regarding claims 16, and 36, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the authentication storage means is specific to that device (Ohashi Col. 11 Lines 65-67 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

Regarding claims 17, and 38, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the authentication process involves the sending of a message and the generation of a response dependent on the message and the predetermined information (Ohashi Col. 12 Line 55 – Col. 13 Line 10 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

Regarding claims 18, 39 and 40, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the telecommunications system includes means for levying a charge for the transaction when authorized (Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

Regarding claims 19 and 20, see Ohashi Fig. 1, and Vatanen Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 37, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that the authentication storage means is associated with the data processing apparatus by being associated with data or software for use by that data processing apparatus (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 1-29 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

Regarding claim 41, Ohashi taught that the data processing apparatus is a personal computer (Ohashi Col. 5 Paragraph 2 and Vatanen Summary of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20).

Regarding claims 46, 49, and 53, while Ohashi and Vatanen disclosed the smart card communicating with a smart card reader, Ohashi failed to disclose the communication being wireless. However, it was well known at the time of invention for smart cards to communicate wirelessly. As such, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the

1 time of invention to have provided the communications wirelessly. This would have been
2 obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to increase the
3 ease of use for the user.

4 Regarding claims 47, 48, 50, and 51, Ohashi and Vatanen taught that that the SIM
5 authenticates the transaction when the SIM is operable in a mobile terminal (Vatanen Summary
6 of the Invention and Col. 4 Line 64 – Col. 5 Line 20 and Fig. 2).

7
8 Claims 4, 6-13, 24, 26-33, 44-45, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
9 unpatentable over Ohashi and Vatanen as applied to claims 1, 21, and 42 above, and further in
10 view of Caputo et al. (US Patent Number 5,778,071) hereinafter referred to as Caputo.

11 Regarding claims 4, 6, 24 and 26, while Ohashi and Vatanen disclosed a smart card
12 reader, and entry of PIN numbers, Ohashi failed to disclose the smart card reader having a
13 keypad or a display.

14 Caputo teaches, in Fig. 1E and Col. 7 Lines 37-61, a smart card reader which has a
15 keypad and a display for facilitating the entry of PIN numbers.

16 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
17 invention to have employed the teachings of Caputo in the smart card system of Ohashi and
18 Vatanen by utilizing the smart card reader of Caputo. This would have been obvious because the
19 ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to provide a
20 specific means for the entry of PIN numbers, as generically suggested by Ohashi.

Regarding claims 7 and 27, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught a data processing module for controlling the communication with the data processing apparatus (See Caputo Fig. 2 Element 172).

Regarding claims 8 and 28, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught that the data processing module of the device is configured for communicating with a corresponding data processing module of the data processing apparatus (Caputo Fig. 5A).

Regarding claims 9 and 29, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught that communication between the authentication storage means and the data processing apparatus is performed via the respective data processing modules (Caputo Fig. 2).

Regarding claims 10, 30 and 44, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught that the data processing module of the device includes means for decrypting encrypted data received from the data processing module of the data processing apparatus (Ohashi Col. 12 Lines 30-36 and Caputo Fig. 6 and Col. 10 Line 51 - Col. 11 Line 59).

Regarding claims 11, 31, and 45, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught the data processing module of the device includes means for encrypting data transmitted to the data processing module of the data processing apparatus (Caputo Fig. 6 and Col. 10 Line 51 - Col. 11 Line 59).

Regarding claims 12, 32, and 52, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught that the respective data processing modules comprise a key for allowing encryption and/or decryption of data (Caputo Fig. 6).

Regarding claims 13, and 33, Ohashi, Vatanen and Caputo taught that the key comprises a shared secret key for each of the respective data processing modules (Caputo Fig. 6 and Col. 10 Line 51 - Col. 11 Line 59).

Conclusion

Claims 1-53 have been rejected.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW T. HENNING whose telephone number is (571)272-3790. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ashok Patel can be reached on (571)272-3972. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew T Henning/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2491